1890-91.
(L.R.).

File No 78 of 90
Serial No 1-to 16

Sub:- Complaint of Narasimhaiah
regarding Shanbogship of
Chikkathimmanahalli
and other villages in the
Gowribidanur Sub-Taluk

P.F. 4 of 96

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1890-91.

~~192~~

(Land Revenue)

File No. 78 of 90

Serial Nos. 1 to 16

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 16

Major ~~Part~~ B for August 1896

SUBJECT.

Complaint of Narsimhaiya re the Shanbhoguship of Chikkemmanahally & other villages in the Gudibanda Sub T.K.

Sp. B Cld

Indexed

WD 2230 [illegible] 000—14-6-20

(221)

Translation of Indibandu Ry Amildar's Ittille No. 107 of 13-11-94

The Inam referred to by the petitioner having been Shanbhavike Service Inam has subsequently been in accordance with the Inam Settlement Register enfranchised with quit rent and title deed No. 1126 granted to Narasimhia. This has not been brought under Service Inam and entered in the Potiji list. Since the Inam land which is situated in this charge and which is registered in the name and in the possession of Narayankaya Shanbogue of Beachajanahalli ~~having been~~ was entered in the Potiji list on account of the Shanbhavike of this charge, since the full assessment on the said Inam land had according to the rules now in force to be recovered and since the said Narayankaya without consenting to pay its full assessment resigned

the Inam land, Seenappa who is conducting the duties of the office of Shanbogue of this Chikka Timmana-halli was enquired into and told that he should take up the land which had been resigned and which was counted towards the Poligi of his charge. He having consented to this, the Inamati was allowed to be in the present Shanbogue's name and its full appointment is being recorded from Seenappa who is conducting the duties of the office of Shanbogue. The said Service Inam is in his possession since the Inam referred by this Sergeant Narasimhia has been settled as a minor Inam it is not in the possession of any body but Narasimhia. The arrears of quitrent, local cess &c. due for this Inam up to Nandana are understood to have been paid by Sergeant Narasimhia himself since the said Narasimhia died

(4) 4

Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of the Kolar District, dated 24th July 1891, No. 12574/296, submitting the entire proceedings connected with the petition of Narasimiah, Police Sergeant, Bangalore City, praying that the Shanbogship of Chikkatimmanahalli and other villages in the Gudibanda Taluk may be registered in his nephew Sreenivas Rao's name.

The facts of the case are as follows:—

On the 4th of December 1878, the Amildar of Gudibanda issued a notice to the appellant Narasimiah (registered Shanbogue) informing him that his Gumasta Veerabhadriah not only failed to satisfactorily discharge his duty as a Shanbogue in the preparation of the Jamabundy accounts &c. but also stayed away from his duty without leave, that he should therefore present himself within the given time

time and remove all difficulties in the work by rendering proper accounts, and that in default of his so doing another competent man would be recommended to the Office.

2. As his whereabouts could not be ascertained the notice was returned unserved on the 5th January 1879. Then the Amildar brought* to the notice of the Deputy Commr. the irregularity and remissness on the part of the Shanbogue, which threw the village accounts into arrears, and proposed in the circumstances of the case to appoint another man to act in the appointment on behalf of Government.

* No. 545/536 dated 11th Decr. 1879

3. The Deputy Commissioner approved of the Amildar's proposal made in the above, and suspended from office the registered Shanbogue Varcasemiah (the appellant) whose absence

* No. 382 dated 15th November 1879.

absence from duty without permission impeded Government work.

4. The Amildar selected one Venkatanarainappah (brother of the present working Shanboque Seenappah) and recommended him to the Deputy Commr. The Deputy Commr. approved of the selection made, appointed the nominee as acting Shanboque and directed the Amildar to place him in possession of all the Inam lands & c. attached to the Office.

No 549 dated 21st November 1879.

No 343 dated 24th November 1879

5. On the 24th of March 1880, and subsequent to this date, acting Shanboque Venkatanarainappah petitioned to the Deputy Commissioner for Confirmation in his appointment, and represented that since the Service Inam lands had been bunkar (waste) for the last 10 years, he found it hard to continue to do duty without remuneration, and that to bring such waste lands under cultivation, his position as Shanboque was not a permanent one, inasmuch as

inasmuchas he had to
give up the Office, when-
-ever the huckadar asked
for it.

6. In his deposition before
the Amildar dated 26th
July 1880, the appellant
...arasimmiah stated
as follows: —

"I heard the petition of
Venkatanaranappah to the
Deputy Commr. read out to
me. In it he prays that
either he must be Confirmed
or he may be paid by the
huckdar for his Services
at 8 Rs: per mensem or
else he would resign the
appointment. I am alone.
my parents dised in my
infancy. I am now being
ed by my sister. I am
on only 15 or 18 years of
ge. If I now take up the
hantogueship myself
am afraid I cannot
arn my livelihood from
. The other lands have
ll been alienated by my
ther. I do not yet know
e full particulars of them.
ther this Seenappah or
ny others may discharge
the

"the duty, letting the produce
"of the Inam lands and
"also receiving the Polagi
"amount for a further
"period of two years. I
"have none to officiate
"for the post. Whether to
"retain the Government
"Pukadary work or to
"give it up is not known
"to me. With reference to
"the order that I should
"either appoint one for the
"conduct of the work or that
"I should give it up for
"good, I have no objection
"to a man being appointed
"to the post, paying him
"the Polagi amount alone,
"and allowing me to enjoy
"the Service Inam lands.
"I will be satisfied ~~If the~~
"if the right to the Service
"Inam lands were vested
"in me. I do not wait to
"have any right to the
"Polagi amount."

In his deposition dated
2nd August 1880, acting
Shanbogue Venkatanara-
nappah said that, were
he confirmed in the
appointment

appointment, he would perform the work willingly on receipt of the Potagi amount alone and leaving the Service Inam lands to be enjoyed by the registered Shanboguey, the appellant.

7. In forwarding the above depositions to the deputy Commr., the Amildar recommended Venkataramappah being confirmed in the appointment, and the arrangements as deposed by him, being carried out.

* No $\frac{532}{514}$ dated 3rd August 1880.

8. The deputy Commissioner thereupon declined to accede to the request of the registered Shanboguey, and observed that either the registered Shanboguey himself take up the appt., or resign it together with the Service Inam lands and directed the Amildar to inform Venkataramappah to continue to do duty, pending settlement at a very early date; and in the event

* No 338 dated 5th August 1880

event of the registered Shanbogue giving up the Office with the Service Inam lands as directed above, a proclamation might be issued, ~~in~~ inviting claimants to the Office, its result being reported to him.

9. Accordingly an Istihar was issued on 20th September 1880, inviting claimants to appear within one month and establish their right to the Office, and declaring that in default of appearance of any claimants, the vacancy would be filled up by the Sircar, and thereafter the rights of the claimants considered as lost.

* No 844 dated 18th October 1880

10. The Amildar reported that no claimants came forward on issuing the proclamation, nor did the registered Shanbogue put forth his appearance. Acting Shanbogue Venkatanaranappah refused to remain in the Office which

which gave him no income. If it were a permanent one, it would afford him some sort of consolation, besides propelling him to energitically discharge his duty as Shanbogue. But since he was not confirmed in his post, he could not be pressed to render accounts Ecovrent and for past years.

11. The deputy Commr. observed that the registered Shanbogue Narasimiah had been suspended for having absented himself without leave, and that in his subsequent statements before the Amildar, he deposed he did not want the appointment. Orders were already issued to appoint Venkatanarayanappah as acting Shanbogue on probation and to see that all the Inam lands were given to his possession. (Vide para 4 Ante).

+ No 549 dated 23rd October 1880.

If

If he gave satisfaction in his work during the probationary period of one years, recommendation for confirmation should be made.

12. The above orders of the Deputy Commissioner were communicated to Venkataneranappah

No 1010 dated 8th November 1880

13. On 26th January 1883, one Krishnappah (brother-in-law of the appellant) petitioned to the Deputy Commissioner, praying for ~~der~~ orders to the Shekadar to nominate a competent Gumasta in his behalf.

No 216 dated 26th January 1883.

14. This petition was referred to the Amildar for report.

15. On a report from the Amildar, explaining the circumstances under which the Acting Shanbogue was appointed, and how he was placed in possession of the Service Inam lands, the

the then deputy Commr. Mr. C. Soobba Row noticed* from the correspondence that Narasimmiah (the appellant) was only suspended from Office, but not dismissed, and that Venkatanaranappa and his brother Seenappah having no manner of proprietory right in the Office, were only Gumastas, and with this observation directed the Amildar to ascertain from Narasimmiah and Krishnappah, as to whom they would nominate to the post as Gumasta in their behalf, and to report on the merits of the individual thus nominated.

16. In their statements before the Amildar dated 14th July 1883, Narasimmiah and his

* No 35 dated 5 May 1883.

his brother-in-law Krishnappah deposed that soon after they ~~were~~ received charge of accounts &c from Seenappah, they would appoint one Balakrishna Row residing at Gudi-banda.

Seenappa in his deposition stated that for the past 4 years he was doing the duty and that he would hand over charge of all the accts to Sircar, if he were remunerated for that period, the Inam lands having been bundar (waste) on the while.

17. The Deputy Commr on submission of the above depositions & enquired the Amildar as to why Seenappah who had already gained experience should not be allowed to Continue

+ No 121 dated 8-8-83.

to do duty, in Case the registered Shanbogue by reason of his nonqualification, was to appoint a Gumasta.

18. The Amildar reported in reply to the above, that Narasimmiah the hukadar Shanbogue was of 22 years of age, was a Constable in the Police Force at Bangalore, that Balakrishna Row chosen by him as his Gumasta refused to act as such, and that the Acting man Seenappah was discharing the duty.

+ No 648 dated 30th December 1884.

19. The Deputy Commissioner desired the Amildar to issue a notice to Narasimmiah, allowing a month's time either to present himself on his duty or to appoint a competent in his behalf and informing

+ No 459 dated 28-1-85

that

that in case of failing to do so, his name would be struck off from the Register and the lands sold for arrears.

20. The Amildar reported that a notice was served on Varadenniah as directed, and that he did not appear in time to get the dispute settled. But in his petition registered No. 92, he represented that the revenue due on the service Inam lands should be recovered from their sale only, and desired to know what hindrance there was to Govern^t. work from Seenappah (Acting Shanboque appointed by Govern^t.).

21. In his petition to the Deputy Comm^r. dated 24th March 1890, Varadenniah prayed that the Shanbogship might be registered in the name of his nephew Sreeni-Vasa Row, because he being employed

employed in the Bangalore Police Force, could not take up the appointment.

22. The then Deputy Commr. Mr. Abdul Rahiman granted the request of the petitioner by appointing the said Sreenivasa Rao to the Shanbogship. * No 18 dated 11-7-90.

23. In his statement before the Hobly Sheikdar, dated 28th August 1890, the Acting Shanbogue Seenappah refused to give charge to Sreenivasa Rao, on the ground that he was a permanent, but not a Gumasta Shanbogue and produced copies of certain orders etc. granted to him and his brother.

One of these is dated 1st September 1879, No 296, issued by the Amildar to Venkataravanappah, informing that he had been appointed to act as Shanbogue.

The 2nd is a notice dated

dated 8th Novr 1880, issued by the Amildar to Venkata-naranappah Conveying the orders of the deputy Commr, contained in para 11. supra.

The 3rd is an order dated 28th July 1882, no 189 granted to Seenappah by the Amildar, appointing him in room of his brother, as prayed for by the latter.

no 20/dated 21-9-90 } 24. The Amildar submitted the entire proceedings to the deputy Commr for orders.

25. The deputy Commr particularising the circumstances that necessitated the appoint of a Gumasta in behalf of Government in place of the registered Shanboque (the appellant) in 1879, and observing the failure on the part of the hukadar either to take up the appointment himself or to appoint his own Gumasta, even though he was granted time for so doing, directed that the

seenappah

Seenappah should continue to do duty and remarked that the right of the registered Shanbogue would be considered, when the post fell vacant either by death or otherwise of the working Shanbogue Seenappah, and on the lines of this order submitted a report to Govern^t. The Govern^t in Proceedings No. $\frac{1810}{P.45}$ dated 12th May 1891, approved of the deputy Comm^r's action, subject to further orders, in case there was an appeal to them in the matter.

26. Thus stand the circumstances of the case, under which ~~the~~ an appeal has been preferred to Govern^t

H. Venkatanarasiah

Precis.

Submitted to the Council

J.P. 22/12/91

Fix a day for
by Peti alone
Give notice

AM
25/12

Hearing 28th
April 1892

H Mohr 8/1/92

Adjourned to 16th
June 1892

H Mohr
30/3/92 30/3

Endorsement No: 3 21

From the Gudibande Sub Taluk office
To Sergeant Narasimmia of the
City Police - Bangalore.

You without paying the quit-rent due for the personal Inam due by you for Chicka Tammana-halli village of Gummanahalli Sammat of this Range you Sub-mitted an appeal petition in English on 29-6-93 to Kolar District Huzur with the Endorsement Hukum No. 73 dated 28-3-93 issued from this office. Thereupon the District Huzur on perusal of the previous records addressed Yadi No. 63 dated 28-8-93 to the Sub Division office Chickaballapur to the Effect that as quit-rent has been charged on Shanbhavike Inam land there is no occasion to deduct the amount from the Potigi amount, that the Inam-dar should be informed by endorsement that if he did not pay up the amount at once the Inam land for which the arrear was due would be attached and sold and that orders should be issued to the Dy. Amildar to sell on account of arrears ~~either~~ according to Rules either the Inam land or the pro-duce if it was sufficient enough.

On this Hukum No. 62 dated 4-9-93 ~~was issued~~ has been issued to directing me to go through the above yadast, to give effect to the directions contained therein and then to submit a report on the matter. Agreeably thereto as you have not as yet paid the Inamati quitrent and local cess amounting to Rs. 4-4-0 together with the notice fee of annas 4-making a total of Rs. 4-8-0 due by you. a notice has been issued for the sale of ~~the~~ his Inam land in the said Village for which the arrears are due fixing the date of sale on the 30th October current. Even now if you pay up the arrears due by you viz Rs. 4-4- plus the notice fee and the interest within the aforesaid date the sale procedure would be stopped - Take notice that if you failed to do this ~~and~~ your takrar ~~of the sale~~ after the sale is regularly conducted on appointed date ~~your~~ would be futile -

Dated 12-9-93.

L.R. 78-90-1

(General Serial No. 31)

189

OFFICE 12109 28 MAR. 1891 DEWAN OF M.

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 23rd March

Despatched 26th

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 3599

No. 838

Submitting report regarding Seenappa of Chikkatammanahalli and 2 other Villages in the Gudibanda Sub Talaak.

Submitted

31/3/91 AR

We have received no Petition in this matter.

I wd pass the following order

"The Govt approve of the action of the Dy Comr subject to further the consideration & orders of Govt if there be any appeal in the matter."

27/4/91

AR 29/4/91

Petition 6/7

27/8/91

Draft SVR 30/4/91

No: 3599
838

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District.

Dated Camp Bowringpet 23rd March 1891.

To.

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honor to report that one Narasimhiah is the registered Shanbogue of Chikkatammanahalli and 2 other villages in the Gudibanda Sub. Taluk.

2. Having absented himself without leave, the Shanbogue was suspended and Venkatnarappa a stranger appointed to act for him by an order of the late Deputy Commissioner Mr. Krishnaiengar, No: 393 dated the 24th November 1879 to the address of the then Amildar of the late Gudibanda Taluk on the subject.

3. The acting incumbent having subsequently applied for confirmation in the post and registered holder having pleaded his inability to discharge the duties of Shanbogue by relinquishing his claim to the office except to the

mam land, the same Deputy Com=
=missioner issued an order No. 549 of
the 23rd October 1880 directing the
continuance of Venkatnaranappa
in the office on probation and the
submission of a recommendation for
his confirmation at the end of a year
if he gave satisfaction in the perfor=
=mance of his duties.

4. In 1882 the said Venkatnaranappa
represented that owing to domestic incon=
venience he could not continue as
shanbogue and his brother Seenappa
was at his request appointed in his
place on probation by an order of
this office No: 253 dated the 20th July 1882.
The latter has since been discharging
his duties satisfactorily.

5. Krishnappa brother-in-law of
Narasimhiah the registered shanbogue
having in 1883 agitated for permission
to employ a Gumasta on behalf of
the Bawardar, some correspondence
passed on the subject and Narasim=
=mahiah was allowed one months
time to join his office or nominate
a competent Gumasta for him
but he did not choose to avail
himself of the opportunity offered

to him for the purposes.

6. The registered holder having thus long slept over his rights, addressed a petition in March 1890 to my prede= =cessor Mr. Abdul Rahman requesting that his nephew (sister's son) Simian Roa might be appointed Shanbhogue in his stead as he himself was employed in the Police Force, Bangalore, and in doing so, he concealed the previous history of the case. His request was granted by an order of the said Deputy Commissioner No. 18 dated the 11th July 1890 evidently without any reference to previous correspondence that had occurred in the case.

7. Seen appa referred to in para 4 above having objected to hand over charge to the new nominee on the ground that his appointment in 1882 was not as a mere gumasta, the matter came up before me and there being under the foregoing cir= =cumstances no sufficient reason

for

for removing an official who has been satisfactorily discharging his duties for a number of years, I have subject to the approval of Government held Mr. Abdul Rahman's order in abeyance and have directed that the present Shanbhague should continue as long as he is capable of serving in the office -

8. The question of allowing the registered holder to take up the post himself or to appoint his own Gumasta may be considered on the occurrence of a vacancy by death or by the retirement of the present incumbent.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

[signature]
Deputy Commissioner.

Appeal is within time.
Petn. sufficiently stamped.
Copy of order produced
under para 1 Rule 1 of
Addl. Rules
Submitted to the Council.
10/6/91 as

(General Serial No. 32.)

1891/92

No. 242

Name of Petitioner. Narasimma
Police Sergt. City Police

Village. Kasba

Taluk. Bangalore

District. [illegible]

Date of Arzi. 2.5.91

Date of Receipt. 4.5.91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Two

Rs. 2 Pro
cel
3 [illegible]

ABSTRACT.

[illegible] that being employ[illegible]
[illegible] Dept. he is unable to [illegible]
up his duties as the Shanbogue [illegible]
[illegible] & 2 other villages [illegible]
[illegible] Range, and [illegible]
[illegible] Srinivasa Rao [illegible]
[illegible] be appo[illegible]
[illegible] accordance [illegible]
the order of the former Dy. [illegible]
Mr. Abdul Rahman, the [illegible]
aside the order of the present
Commr.

Dy. Commr's Order No. 24.

The records have been perm[illegible]
& the parties examined. As
[illegible] Shanbogue Nara[illegible]
[illegible] absented from duty
permission [illegible]

L.R. 18-90-2.

...ears as a matter of Course, he
...suspended & one Venkata-
...ranappa was appointed to
...(Order No 393). When Venkata-
...ranappa requested to be con-
...ned, some Correspondence
...place and Narasimmayya
...ve a Kyfiyat that he did not want
...old the office any longer. After
...time at the request of Venkatanaranappah
...lder brother Sinappa was ap-
...ted on probation in his stead in
...No 253 of 20/7/82. Subsequently
...Narasimmayya's brother-in-
...Krishnappa claimed the
...ubogueship, notice was given
...Narasimmayya that wi...
...th he must be on duty or he m...
...it a qualified Gumast...
...that if he failed to do so, his
...ne wd be struck off the Re...
...No 459 of 28/12/85 the Dy: Amildar
...udibanda Range stated that
...asimmayya had neglected ...
...ie given him and had en-
...ed if Govt business had suf-
...d in any way in Consequence
...bogon Sinappa holding
...ice of Gumasta. Long after this
...asimmayya represented
...Dy: Comnr (Mr Abdul Rhyman)
...he was employed in the Police
...ed not take charge of the

Shanbogueship, and requested that his sister's son Srinivasa Rao be nominated to the office. The Dy: Commr. thereupon directed that Sinappa shd make over the charge to Srinivasa Rao. (Order No 18 of 11.7.90). Sinappa is still refusing to deliver over charge on the ground that he has been discharging the duties of the office since /82.

As Sinappa is performing his duties satisfactorily and Narasimmayya failed to appoint, as required, a qualified Gumasta, it is not fair now to oust the said Gumasta. He shd look after the duties as long as he is able and after that Narasimmayya's request may be considered.

(General Serial No. 30).

31

189/.

From

(8)

To The Deputy Commr.
Kolar District

L.R.78-90-3

Dated 12th

Despatched May/91

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 1810 Re
No. P 45.

Approving of the action of the Deputy Commissioner in connection with the Shanbogueship of Chikkatimanhalli & other villages of Gudibanda Taluk.

35

(8)

Read:-

Letter No. 3597/838 dated 23d March 1891 from the Dy Commr Kolar reporting on the action taken by him in the Connection with the Shanbogueship of Chicka-tammana halli & 2 other villages in the Gudibanda Sub. Talug.

Order thereon:- No. 1810/845 Rd

One Narasimiah registered Shanbogue of Chickatammanahalli & 2 other villages, was suspended in 1879 and a Stranger Venkatanarnappa appointed to act. In 1880, the actg incumbent applied for confirmation & the registered holder relinquish his claim to the Office on except the Inam on the plea of inability to discharge the duties and the then Dy. Commr directed the Continuance of the actg. incumbent for a year subject to Confirmation on a report thereafter by the amildar of the Satis-

factory conduct of the duties ~~by the Acctg. Shanbogue~~ In 1882 one Seenappa the brother of Venkatnam was at his own request appointed on probation.

2. In 1883 one ~~Narasimiah~~ Krishnappa the brother-in-law of the registerdar Narasimiah agitated the question of the Barawarddar's right to appoint a gumasta & ~~aft~~ Narasimiah was allowed a month's time to rejoin his appointment or ~~appoint~~ nominate a competent gumasta. But he ~~[illegible]~~ apparently ~~in apathy~~ slept over his rights till 1890 when ~~[illegible]~~ he presented a petn to Mr Abdul ~~[illegible]~~ Rahman requesting that his nephew Srinivassa Row might be appointed Shanbogue in his stead as he himself was employed in the Bangalore Police & in this petn he concealed the previous history of the case, & Mr Abdul Rahman granted his request without reference to the previous correspondence in the matter

3. Seenappa the actg. incumbent objected to give over charge and the present Dy. Commr Mr Madiah has considered it best not to disturb the ~~arrang~~ the present holder who has been satisfactorily discharging the duties for a number of years & to consider the claims of Krishnappa on the occurrence of a Vacancy.

4. The Govt. approve of the action of the Dy. Commr subject to further consideration and orders of Govt if there be any appeal in the matter.

8/5/91 12/5 19/5/91

Draft. Under Secy

To

The Dy. Commr

Kolar Dt.

S.K.R. 30/4/91

AR

Council order.

Draft for the approval of
Council.

AH
12/5

No. 84 K

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

36

(9)

The accompanying Petition No. 2 of 2 dated 2d May/91 received at the Dewan's Office from Narasimmayya, Police Sergt, City Police, Kasba Bangalore,

L.R. 78-90-4

From Resume No. 1254 dt 24/7/91

is forwarded, together with its two enclosures, to the Dy. Comr., Kolar Distt. for submission of Progs & a precis thereof.

By Order,

BANGALORE,
29/6/1891.
15/7

For Chief Secretary.

Drafted as per C's order.

AR

Note

3904

(General Serial No. 30). P. 22

1891

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

(9)

To The Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 24th July 1891

Despatched 25

Received

Enclosures No. 3 + 1 file

General No. 1254

No. 296

Forwards for reference and obliging return the original Records Connected with the petition of Narsimmaiya Police Sargeant City Bangalore.

Petition to Pres 18/7/91

H. Venkatanarasiah for precis.

31/7/91 AR

Precis submitted

HV

1278-90-5

To the same No. 5761 d/29/6/92 P. 82

No. 1254/296 Enc. & Office

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Kolar District
Dated 24/25th July 1891.

To,

The Chief secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore

Sir,

Adverting to your official memorandum no 84 of the 29th Ultimo forwarding for submission of Proceedings with a precis a petition from Narasimiah, Police sergeant, city Police, Kasaba Bangalore, I have the honor to refer you to this office letter no 3599/838 of the 23rd March last Explaining all the circumstances of the case and to the order passed thereon by Government in their Proceedings no 1810/P 45 dated the 12th May 1891.

+ Herewith returned with Enclosures.

2. The original records bearing on the subject as per accompanying Tarist are herewith submitted for reference

reference and obliging return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

R. Samuel [illegible]

for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

[illegible]

Papers connected with the Shanbogueship of Chickkathamanahully & other villages of Gudibanda Talu.

no.	Particulars	no: of papers
1.	Order no 25 Dated 29-7-90 from the Gudibanda Amildar to the Sheikdar of Somanahully 29-7-90 and the report of the Sheikdar	2
2.	Deposition of Sharnappah	2
3.	Copy of order no 296 Dated 1st Sept. 79 from the Gudibande Talug to Venkata Narniah son of Padmanabhia	1
4.	Copy of notice issued by the Talug authorities to Venkat Narnappah	1
5.	Do Do to Sharnappah	1
6.	Order no 219 Dated 22-3-90 from the Dy Comr. to the Deputy Amildar of Gudibande Talug	1
7.	Order no 189 from the Deputy Amildar Gudibande to Sharnappah brother of Venkat Narnappa	1
8.	Petition Dated 23-8-90 to the Deputy Amildar Gudibande by Narsimiah Registered Shanbogue of Chickka Thimmanahully & other villages	1
9.	Petition Dated 3-9-90 to the Dy Amildar Gudibande by Sreeninasa Rao of Chickka-Thimmanahully.	1
10.	Hukkum no 119 to the Sheikdar of Somanahully	1
11	Sharnappa's petition to the Dy Commissioner Kolar Dt, order thereon to the Dy Amildar and his report no 202 Dated 24-9-90.	1

12. Narsimiah's petition in the Talug and Sheikdar's report no 199 dated 13-10-90

13. Narsimiah's petition to the Dy Commissioner Kolar Dt. 26-9-90

14. Sreeniwas Row's petition to the Dy Comr. 24-10-90. 1

15. Sreeniwas Row's petition to the Dy Comr. 10-12-90 1

16. Do on 10-2-91 1

17. Order no 881 dated 15-2-91 from the Dy Comr. Kolar Dt. to the Amildar of Bangalore. and the Amildar's report dated March 91 2

18. Notice dated 15-2-91 to Narsimiah 1

19 Order no 489 dated 23-2-91 from the Dy Comr. Kolar Dt. to the Amildar of Chickballapur and his report thereon

20 Notice to Sreeniwasa Row of Chickballapur

21 Hukkum from the Dy Commissioner Kolar to the Dy Amildar Gudibanda & his report dated 2-3-91. 1

22 Notice from the Dy Commissioner Kolar to Sharnappah & his brother Venkata Narnappah 1

23. Order no 360 dated 23-2-91 from the Dy Amildar Gudibanda to the Sheikdar of Somanahully & his report dated 24th Feb 91 1

24. Petition from Narsimiah to the Dy Comr. Kolar District dated 4-3-91 1

25. Jamabandi Patty prepared in the Talug containing following papers. 1

26. Petition to the Dy Commissioner Kolar Dt. by Krishnappah of Chickkaballapur & order thereon to the Dy Amildar of Gudibanda & his report

27. Order from the Dy Commissioner to the Dy Amildar of Gudibanda.

28 Receipt from Narsimia for having taken back Inamty Patte nos. 62121 & 62122

29. Dy Amildar's report no 35 to the Dy Commissioner & order thereon

30. Dy Amildar's report no 131 to the Dy Comr. & order no 121 thereon

31. Ittilla no 648 of the Dy Amildar & order of the Dy Comr. thereon.

32. Dy Amildar's report no 459 & order thereon

33. Venkata Narnappa's petition to the Dy Comr. Kolar Dt. & order thereon to the Amildar

34 Venkata Narnappa's petition to the Dy Comr. on 24-3-80

35 Do Do on 5-4-80

36. Report from the Dy Amildar Gudibanda to the Dy Commissioner Kolar Dt.

37 Dy ~~Amildar's report~~ Commissioner's Hukkum no 338 Dy 5-8-80

38 Dy Amildar's report no 844 & order there

39 Hukkum to the Sheikdar of Mandigal from the Taluq & his report

40 Sheikdar's report publishing Isthihar

41 Deposition of Venkata Narnappah in Gudibande Talug
42. Do Do Lakshmi Narsimiah Do
43. Amildar's report no 545 to the Dy Comr. Kolar & order thereon
44 Amildar's report no 569 to the Dy Comr. & order
45 Notice to Narsimia from Gudibande Talug
46. Takit to Mandical Sheikdar & his report no 628
47 Report from the Potel of Chickka Thammanhully
48 Venkata Narnappa's Deposition in Gudibande
49 Deposition of Narsimia & Krishnappah
50. Deposition of Narnappah in the Talug
51 Yady no 81 to Chickkaballapur Talug
52 Notice to Krishnappah Batty a Amrem
53. Yady no 189 to the Talug Amildar Bangalore & repl
54 notice to Narsimiah by the Amildar Gudibande
55. notice to Balakrishnakar
56. Narsimia's petition to the Dy Comr. Kolar Dt. 24-3-90 & Dy Comr's orders to Dy Amildar & his report dated 10-4-91
57 Appeal no 17 of 91 with enclosures viz Power of Attorney &c copies.

Mr. Bhimaka
26/3/91

Mr. Bhimaka
26/3/91

Mr. Bhimaka
28/3/91

57

Two Rupees stamp affixed No. 242

In the Court of the Dewan Regd
to H.H. The Maharaja
of Mysore
Appeal No. 17 of 1891
Bangalore

Mis: Rev: Appeal No 17 of 91.

Appellant
Narasimhiah, Police
Sergt, City Police
Bangalore

Respondent
Senappah, Goomasta of the appellant residing at Beechaganahally, Goodibanda Range, Baganahally Taluk.

The appellant most respectfully begs to prefer this appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, in Rev: Case No 248 of 6th March 1891 on the file of his Court for the following reasons:—

That the appellant is the Shanboga of Chickka Timiah Garahally, Nadarannahally & Kuppakotanahally Villages.

II. That the appellant was a minor at his father's death in 1879 & the Govt. appointed Venkatanarayanappa as the appellant's Goomasta then and he was doing the duties of Shanbogue of the said Villages till ~~in~~ 1882 on trial.

III. That the Goomasta of the appellant put in a petition to confirmed as the Shanbogue Goomasta, a year after his acting appointment, and the Deputy Commissioner on which wrote to the Amildar that he could recommend Venkatanarayanappa if he did his duties satisfactorily.

IV. That by misrepresentation & coercion appellant's deposition was taken to the effect that he was not ~~willing~~ willing to be a Shanbogue of the said Villages.

V. That immediately after the appellant's deposition was given appellant's brother-in-law presented a petition to the Deputy Commissioner that appellant was a minor & that he was in his guardianship & that the deposition was given by the appellant through ignorance.

VI. That the Dy Commissioner Mr. Subba Row passed on order to the effect that the appellant should be the Shanbogu of the said Villages & that a Goomastha might be appointed in his stead.

VII. That the appellant's brother-in-law produced one Balakristna Row before the Dy Amildar to be appellant's Gumastha & on a reference being made to the Dy Commissioner orders were issued that either appellant should take charge of his duties of Shanbogu or that Venkatnarayanappah's brother Seenappah should do the duties of Shanobogu.

VIII. That appellant was unable to assume charge of his duties of Shanobogu as the appellant was employed in the Police Department.

IX. That Appellant gave a petition to the Dy Amildar praying that his sister's son Sreenivasa Row may be appointed his Gumastha and seeing that no orders were passed on his petition, he presented a petition to the Dy Commissioner in 1890 praying that Sreenivasa Row's name may be

substituted for the appellant and take work from him.

X. That Mr. Abdool Rahiman the then by Commissioner passed orders that petitioner's nominee might be appointed Shanobogue of the said Villages and directed the Amildar of Goodiehanda to direct Seenappah to hand over charge of the Shanobogue duties to Sreenivasa Row as per orders here with attached.

XI. That the Amildar then directed the Shaikdar of Somainahally to order the Shanobogue's goomastha to hand over the charge of Shanobogueship to Sreenivasa Row.

XII. That the Shanobogue's Gumastha Seenappa refused to hand over the charge to Sreenivasa Row & on this the Amildar reported the to the by Commissioner & on making some enquiries passed at last the orders against which this appeal is now preferred.

XIII. That the present by Commission is wrong in having set aside the orders of the former by Com: Mr. Abdool Rahiman which is ultra vires.

48

XIV That Petitioner's nannie who is the appellant's sister's son has a preferential right to the Shanobogue ship than the present Gumastha who is no relation of the appellant and is of a different sect.

XV. That the Present Dy Commissioner Mr. Madiah's decision is against law and procedure.

XVI That the Gumastha Seenappah has left Inam lands of the Shanobogue uncultivated for the last 10 years and is which an imprudential: but the Appellant is found to pay the Cundayam of the said lands up to date without getting a grain from those lands

XVII That the Appellant therefore prays that the orders of the Dy Com. Mr. Abdool Rahiman may be given Effect to or that the Appellant's nominee may be appointed his Gumastha & work taken from him as such.

Bangalore
2nd May 1891

A. Shimila
Appellant's Admy

(General Serial No. 80.)

49

189 .

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

(2)

To

The Deputy Comm^r,
Kolar Dt.

L. R. 78-90-6

Dated 29th
Despatched ~~29th~~ } June/92
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 5761 Re
No. P82 B

Directing that Appellant Narasimmayya be registered as Shanbogue of Chikkatimmanahalli sen villages, Gurdibanda Tk sen.

References to be marked.

Bef[illegible] [illegible]ss the Maharaja of Mysore.

[illegible]ppeal No. 17 of 1891

(12)

Appel[illegible] Vs. Respondent.

Narasimhia of Bangalore represented by Mr. Bhima Row, advocate

Sinappa

Decision. 22-6-92

Appellant was Shanbogue. He absented himself without leave and was suspended on that account in 1879 and Respondent's brother — a stranger — was appointed acting. In 1882 Respondent succeeded his brother. In 1880, Appellant stated that he could not appoint any one as gumasta, and that he would be satisfied if he were allowed to enjoy Inam lands. The Deputy Commr did not consent to allow him to enjoy service lands. In 1883, the Deputy Commissioner again enquired whether appellant would nominate a gumasta. Appellant deposed that he would appoint a gumasta, if he was allowed to have charge of the accounts. Respondent declined to give

over charge. In 1885 Appellant was again asked to nominate a gumasta within one month. But he did not do so. In 1890, Appellant requested that his appointment might be given to Greenwood Shaw, his sister's son, and the Deputy Commissioner (~~[illegible]~~) granted the request in July 1890, ~~[illegible]~~ but this order was set aside by the present Deputy Commissioner with the permission of Government and Respondent continues in possession.

2. The Government consider that appellant having long failed to make arrangements for the discharge of the duties of the Office, is not entitled to much consideration. Even now he is unable to take up the duties of his Office and wants only to appoint a gumasta.

3. Under these circumstances, the Government do not think it proper to turn out the man who has been satisfactorily doing duties for 9 years. The Appellant will be registered as Shanbogue and the Respondent as his gumasta. When the Respondent dies, or is otherwise disqualified to hold the Office, the Appellant can,

PM No. 17 of 1891 (11)

Appt
Narasimha
of Bangalore
represented by
Mr Bhimarao
advocate

Respdt
Sinappa.

Appt was shanthay - He absented [illegible] without leave & was suspended on that account in 1879, & Respdt's brother - a stranger - was appointed agt. & in 1882 Respdt succeeded his brother. In 1880, appt stated that he cared not appoint any one as gumasta, & that he wd be satisfied if he were allowed to enjoy ~~[illegible]~~ lands. Dy Comr did not consent to allow him to enjoy some lands - In 1883, the Dy Comr again enquired whether appt wd nominate a gumasta - ~~to~~ appt deposed ~~[illegible]~~ that he wd appoint a gumasta, if he was ~~[illegible]~~ allowed to have charge of the accounts. Respdt declined to give our charge - In 1885, Appt was again asked to nominate a gumasta within one month - ~~He~~ But he did not do so - In 1890, ~~[illegible]~~ Appt requested that his appointment might be given to Srinivasarao his sister's son & the Dy Comr granted the request in July 1890. but this order was ~~again~~ set aside by the present Dy Comr, with

the permission of Govt & Respdt continues in possession.—

The Govt consider that appellant having long failed to make arrangements for the discharge of the duties of the office, is not entitled to much consideration.— Even now he is unable to take up the duties of his office, & wants only to appoint a gumasta.—

Under these circumstances, the Govt do not think it proper to turn out the man who has been satisfactorily doing duties for 9 years.— The appellant will be registered as Shanthoy, & the Respdt as his gumasta. When the Respdt dies, or is otherwise disqualified to hold the office, the

55

Appt may be
allowed to nominate
a suitable gumasta
U.S.
21/6/92

This is my view
If Mr J. A. Chellyar
considers, he may
at once be allowed
to nominate a
gumasta, I
shall not object
U.S.

be allowed to nominate a suitable gumasta.

"By order"

[signature]

Chief Secretary

28/6/92

No 5761/Pet 82 dated 29/6/92 2/7/92

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commr Kolar Distt with the ver papers received with his No. 1254/296 of 24 July/91.

"By order"

[signature]

Chief Secretary

Draft

BCN

No. 17 of 1891

Appellant
Narasimhia of Bangalore represented by Mr Sheema Rao advocate

Endorsement.

Respondent
Seen

(10)

In reply to his Petition dated 2d May 1891

R. 78-90-7.

Appellant

is informed that under the circumsta of the case, the Government do not think it proper to turn the man who has been satisfactorily doing duties for 9 years. The Appellant will be registered Shanbogue and the Respondent as his gumastha.

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
June 1892.

L.R. 78-90-8

(General Serial No. 32.)

1894.

(13)

No. 3320

Name of Petitioner. Narasimma Sergeant - City Police

Village.

Taluk. Bangalore

District.

Date of Arzi. 19-5-94

Date of Receipt. 21-5-94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

Submitted

In time (Calculations based on unauthenticated Copy)

Stamp Sufficient

The Original endorsement or an authenticated Copy of it has not been produced. Petr has only produced a private Copy of the endorsement. The endorsement is to this effect:-

"The Deputy Amildar has granted you an endorsement conveying my orders. Act accordingly" (21-2-94).

The Dy Amildar's endorsement referred to has not been produced either

[illegible] 7/6/94

Recd at Mysore 9/6

[illegible]

[illegible] 7/6

[illegible]

22-6-94

ABSTRACT.

Sta[illegible] that he is the Registrar to the office of Shanbogue of Chicka Timmanahalli, Nadavanahalli & Vorada Kalenahalli that the foot without his consent are getting the work done by a Sumasta whereby he has been deprived of a source of income to maintain his family, that though applied for he was not permitted to nominate his own man as Sumasta; that though the then Dy. Comr. Mr. Abdul Rahiman had sanctioned to transfer his Hak to another man the present Dy. Comr. cancelled it and nominated another Sumasta who with the intention of usurping his Inam lands instigated the rights not to cultivate them; that he is paying assessment on these lands without any adequate return; that when he had requested the Dy. Comr. that he might be granted half of the Potage amount out of which in

58

he deducted the assessment due by him ~~as~~ he was granted endorsement of 21-2-94 to the effect that ~~as~~ the Dy. Amilcar having granted an endorsement to him in pursuance of his order he should act up to it; and that the Dy. Comr. was not pleased to help the petitioner in ~~pursuance~~ accordance with para 5 ~~under~~ Sec. 43 of the Land Rev. Rules.

Prays that orders may be issued for the payment of half of the Polisi amount and if this cannot be done he may be permitted to nominate his own Jemaster.

Before Pet. ~~that~~ the order he has prod. relates to a matter which is different from that alluded to in his petn. —

Pet. must produce copy of order passed by Dy. Comr. in regard to Polisi after Sanction of Jemt. of which he complains in his petn. [illegible]

Vide Cons. Endt. [illegible] paper [illegible] 8/8

COURT FEE ... COURT FEE

Two Rupees Stamp

HYDERABAD DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. No. 633...
DATE 21-3-54

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 126 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

4 [illegible]
[illegible]

(5) [illegible] 21-2-94 [illegible] 26 [illegible]

(6) [illegible] 43 [illegible] 5 [illegible]

(7) [illegible] 5 [illegible]

[illegible]

(8) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 19-5-94 [illegible] - [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
20-8-94 [illegible]

(15)

[illegible] 3672.

L.R. 78-90-9

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24-6-94 [illegible]

[illegible]

12-9-93 [illegible]

[illegible]

By order

Draft. Chief Secretary

63

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

189 (17)

No. 869

Name of Petitioner. Narasimha Aya

Village.

Taluk. Bangalore

District.

Date of Arzi. 19-9-94

Date of Receipt. 20-9-94

Date of Disposal. "

No. of Enclosures. "

L.R-78-90-10

Petn is in English

Submitted with references -

The latest Council order in Petr's case is recorded on Petn No 3320 - As directed therein Petr was called upon to produce the order of the Dy Comr in regard to Potagi allowance & nomination of Gumasta. The Petr in his Petition No 638 & 24-8-94 states that the Dy Comr has passed no other order but what he has already produced. A translation of it is with the file. It has dealt with the Petr's prayer to have the quit rent of Service Inam deducted from the Potagi, one of the alternative reliefs sought by him.

The final order refusing Petr's prayer for permission to nominate his own Gumasta was passed by Govt in June 1892, vide Decision in appeal No 17 of 1891, put up herewith.

It is seen from that decision that Petr's prayer to be allowed the enjoyment of the Service Inam was refused by the Dy Comr. If Petr is not in enjoymt of it, the question is who has possession of it & who should be made to pay the quit rent.

If Petr is not in possession of either the office, or the lands or the Potagi, can he be compelled to pay the quit rent merely because he is the Barawarddar. If the Gumasta is content with the Potagi & does not want the produce of the lands, the Petr may, it seems, be given possession of these, when, he could be required to pay the quit rent. If the Gumasta is in possession of the lands, it is a matter for consideration whether he ought not to pay the quit rent. It has to be ascertained who is actually in possession.

Petr prays for stay of sale

[illegible] 31/10

ABSTRACT.

With reference to this office endorsement No 3670 dated 11th August 94, states that he forwarded the papers to this office on 24th June 1894, and prays for the removal of the present Shanbhoga Gumasta of Chikka Thimmanahalli and other villages in Gudibanda Taluk or order him to pay petitioner a moiety of the Photagi.

[illegible] 21/9

Judl Councillor's order "Register & submit for orders with references 20/9/94."

Pet 686 ✓

64

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(19)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 869

dated 19 - 9 - 94 received at the

Dewan's Office from Narasimhayya residing in Bangalore, complain of the order passed by the Deputy Commr regarding the quit rent due on the Service Inams attached to the Shanbhog of Chikthimmanhalli & other villages, Gudibanda taluk

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~

~~enclosures~~, to the Deputy Commr Kolar District, for report as to who is in actual possession of the Service Inams and who is liable to pay the quit-rent.

2 The Deputy Commissioner is requested to stay the sale of the lands in question pending report

3 The Petition should be returned

Y.R. 78-90-11

By Order,

Draft (Council order)

1/11/94

BANGALORE, 1/11/ 1894

Chief Secretary.

1/11

M.G.C.P. Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

L.R. 78-90-12

65

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

1895

(21)

No. 2970

Name of Petitioner. Narasimmia

Village. Sergeant in the City Police - Bangalore

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arst. 6-5-95

Date of Receipt. 8-5-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

Sub^d to the Rev. Councillor

Pet^r is the registered Shanbhog of certain villages in the Gudibanda Sub Taluk. He applied for permission to nominate his own Gumasta in lieu of the present one, but the app^n was refused in June 1892 - He asked to be allowed the enjoyment of Service Inam lands but that app^n was also refused. Though not in actual possession of the office or emoluments, he seems to have been required to pay the quit rent &c of the Service Inam lands, whereupon he petitioned for an order that the same sh^d be deducted from the Potagi paid to the Gumasta -

In pursuance of the order passed on Pet^n No 869 by the Senior Councillor the D^y Com^r was asked in Novr last to stay the sale of Pet^r lands, and to report who was in actual possession of the Service Inam lands & who was liable to pay the quit rent - The D^y Com^r report has not yet been received - He states he has addressed an urgent reminder to the Sub^d off^r

In this Pet^n petitioner urges that one of the Service Inams is advertized for sale on 28th Instant - In the Istihar the land is called Brahmadaya but Pet^r says that is wrong.

He prays for stay of sale & for the other reliefs sought. ~~in the ...~~

14/5 Send a reminder to the D^y Com^r - The Tale has already reminded

Abstract.

States that he is the registered Shanbhogue of Chicka Tammanahalli and another village in Gudibanda Sub Taluk - that he has been praying for the last 6 or 7 years that the assessment on his Service Inam lands may be deducted from the Potagi that during last year he was granted an endorsement from this office to say that a letter had been written to the D^y Com^r Kolar asking him to stay the sale of the Inam lands and to submit the proceedings connected with the matter - that on 15-4-95 he submitted a petition to this office enclosing the notice served on him by the D^y Amildar of Gudibanda calling upon him to pay the assessment

Whereupon he stayed & if it goes on in spite of the order it will not be valid. So the order should be repeated again

30/5/95

on his Inam lands for 1894-95 - that as the said notice does not make any mention of the arrears due for the last year he presumes that the same might have been deducted from the Potigi - that he has informed the Taluk that there was no reason to send him this notice while his petition is pending disposal in this office that in spite of it the Taluk authorities have sent for his information the enclosed notification of the sale of his Inam lands which is fixed to be held on the 28th inst. Prays that early orders may be issued to stay the sale till the matter is finally disposed of in this office

Further states that his Inam lands are valuable ones. that they are intending to obtain them for a trifling sum that his service Inam lands are mentioned in the notice as Brahmadaya - that he is at a loss to know why the same was transferred from the service head to that of Brahmadaya - and invites attention to para 5 sec 3 of the [illegible] and that the Gumasta is enjoying the produce of the Tamarind trees on his Inam lands

His principal prayers are:-

1. That if on removing the Gumasta appointed by Govt. he is ~~nominated~~ permitted to nominate his own Gumasta he himself would pay the assessment on his Inam lands - &

2. That if the Govt. do not intend the removal of the said Gumasta for the present - if half of the Potigi is paid for his maintenance he would pay the assessment

MY
REG'D. No. 2970
DATE 8-5-95

Recd.
8-5-95
2970

[illegible]

[illegible]

Gen. 31.]

189.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
17694
13. JUN. 1895
R4792
Pet 479

R ϕ
13/6/95
Vide slip for Rev Dept. order

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

To
The Revenue Secretary to the Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Subd. to the Rev. Councillor with translation of the Amildars report & the file
[illegible] -15/6

Dated 10th June 1895
Despatched 12th
Received
General No. 4799
No. 1483
Enclosure No. 1

L. R. 78-90-13

His official memorandum No: 586 dated the 1st November 1894 forwarding for report a petition from Narasimhiah residing in Bangalore complaining of the order passed by this Office, regarding the quit-rent due on the Service Inams attached to the Shanbhogi of Chickthimmanahalli and other villages, Gudibanda Sub-Taluk.

— " —

With reference to the above, has the honor to submit for

information the accompanying copy of the Gudibanda Deputy Amildar's Urzi No: 107 dated 13th November 1894 received with the Chickballapur Sub-Division officer's Docket No: 416 of the 2nd Instant from which it will be observed that the land in question is an enfranchised Inam having now nothing to do with the Office of Shanbhog though it was formerly part of Serkar Shanbhogee service Inam lands and that the same is in the possession of the Petitioner who is liable to pay the quit-rent due thereon to Government.

Translation is Mtd

2. It however, appears, from the Deputy Amildar's report that the arrear due on the land for Vijaya (1893-94) has been paid up by the Patel of Chickthimmanahalli village

as fine ~~[illegible]~~ apparently voluntary for the omission to bring the Petr's default to pay the Khists due immediately to the notice of higher authorities.

[signature]
Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

108
10.11.94

71

1126

[illegible] 6 [illegible] 248 [illegible] 20.4.91 [illegible] 27.3.91 [illegible] 13.11.94 [illegible]

(Signed) B. Tirumalachar

Copy

Deputy Commissioner
Kolar

[illegible] Councillors
order on the
accompanying Cover
To
20-9-94

Stamped for the 1st petition

T. R. A. Thumboo Chettiyar Esqr.

Member of H. H. The Maharaj
Council.

~~709~~ 1692
20-9-94

Most Honoured Sir

The undersigned most humbly and respectfully beg to lay before your honour the following few lines fully believing that my earnest request will be crowned with Success.

I am the registrar and the legal [illegible] of the [illegible] Thimmanahally and others in Guditana Sub Talook Kolar District.

I petitioned to the Dewan Bahadur of Mysore requesting His Excellency to remove the present Gumasta and to take the shanbo work from a competent man of my own, which I received an endorsement in 1891 from this honourable Court to the effect that the present gumasta is a man appointed by the Government and that he should continue to work as the gumasta till he is found fit or untill he is found at faul

I then requested the Dewan Bahadur either to take work from my own gumasta or

to get me half of the Potige amount to which I am entitled as a legal claimant. I was ordered that if I apply to the Deputy Commissio Kolar District for the same relief and I may b granted my humble request.

I then petitioned to the Deputy Amildar of gudibanda Sub Talook requesting him to g me half of the Potige amount and to deduct the same for the quitrent of my shanbo Inam lands and was told that it shall not be done and that I should pay the quitrent due to the government &c.

The Inam lands have been uncul through the instigation of the present [illegible] them cultivated. The Proclamation of the publication of my Inam lands by the government was also circulated throug the influence of the gumasta and hi friends with the then Deputy Amildar

I appealed to the Sub Divisional Off of Chickaballapur and to the Deputy Commissioner against the decision and the proceedure of the deputy Amildar in this case, regret much to say tha these officers paid no heed to my reque and simply ordered me to be abide by the decision of Deputy Amildar.

Being disappointed at every point bu

by the District and other authorities I
again petitioned to the Dewan Bahadur
on 19.5.94 and received an order No 3320 / 22.6.9
ordering me to forward the original
endorsements of the Deputy Commissioner
and others and in accordence with which I
submitted all the records and orders of the
case on 24.6.94 I again received an order
No 3670 / 11.8.94 ordering me for the papers to
which I have duly replied stating that
I sent the papers connected with the case
on 24.6.94 The Government have again
sent in a demand on 8.8.94 for the
quitrent due of my Inam lands
[illegible] that a case of [illegible]
nature was lately desided in favour of
Thammaiya registrar of Hosa agrahar
in Yadalore Talook Mysore District
in this honourable Court.

In conclusion I humbly and
respectfully beg leave to request
that either an order to the concerned
authorities to take work from my
own man or to grant me a money
of Potige amount as has been desided
in many cases, and thus relieve me
a poor and a forlorn one from the public
and misery.

For which act of Kindness I shall
as in duty bound ever pray

I remain

Most Honoured Sir

Your most obedient

and humble servant.

(Signed) Narasimha Ly

Sergeant

City Police

Bangalore

19th Sept. 1894

The Dy. Commr. solicits the favour of early orders on the case.

Subd. to the 2nd Councillor in Continuation of G.L. No. 17194 of 10/6/95 R 779 subd. on 15/7/95 – [illegible]

11-5-96

Subd. M. 11/5/96

Submitted with Kolar Dy. Commr's No. 4799/1483 of 10.6.95.

[illegible] 12/5/96.

The only point which requires orders is about the collection of the quit rent due on a private enfranchised Inam in the holding of the Petr. – The Dy. Commr's report shows that this land has no connection whatever with the Shanbogue's Inam service – The Petr. has admittedly allowed the land to lie fallow on account of his misunderstanding with the Shanbogue. For this result he has none to blame but himself – The procedure is to be regulated by Sec. 59 of L. Rule XXXVI of the Glossary para 5 thereunder, and not para 3. The Dy. Commr. will dispose of this matter [illegible]

Pd 779 of 941.

Gen. 31.]

1896 (23) 77 826 of Pet 700 4 MAY

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar District

To Revenue and General The Secretary to the Government Dewan of Mysore.

L. R. 78–90–114.

Dated 22nd April 96

Despatched 2nd May 1896

Received

General No. 4093 / No. 1082

Enclosure No. 1 file

Reporting on the petition of Narayanrao residing in Bangalore

[illegible] 1892 [illegible] the Shanbogue [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] The question of the [illegible] of Shanbogue to the [illegible] already decided by [illegible] in 1892 & cannot now be reopened – It is [illegible] with [illegible] the Shanbogue [illegible]

[illegible] 13/5/96

[illegible] 13/5/96

Refer [illegible] to [illegible] G.L. No. 17194 R 779 of 10.6.95

[illegible] 13/5/96 95-[illegible]

Rec'd [illegible] 7.8.96 [illegible]

28.

Kolar Dy. Commr's office
Dated the 22nd april 1896
Camp Mysore.

To,

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore.
Revenue and General Depts.

Sir,

With reference to previous correspondence ending with this office Docket No. 4799/1483 dated 10th June 1895. relative to the petition of Narasimhiah residing in Bangalore complaining of the order regarding the quit-rent due on certain Inam lands formerly attached to the Shanbhogi of Chicktimmanahalli and other villages, Gudibanda Sub-Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Amildar reports that the arrears outstanding against the Petitioner for Jaya (1894-95) Fasli also since been recovered from the patel of the village who cultivated the lands for that year without permission from the Khakdar or from Government.

2. The quit rent with the prescribed local cess

cess due on the Inam lands in question for the year 1895-96 viz Rs 44/ remains unpaid. A demand was served on the petitioner for the same on the 1st Instant but he refuses to pay the amount pending the decision of his appeal to Government

3. I therefore solicit the favor of early orders in the case.

4. The vernacular Proceedings bearing on the subject as per accompanying Teriat are herewith submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Officiating Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

(25) 80

Mr Draft

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore

Read

Petitions nos 869, 2757 & 2970 dated 19.9.94 15-4-95 & 6-5-95 respectively from Narasimayya of Bangalore complaining of the order of the Deputy Commr. of Kolar about the collection of quit rent on a certain Inam land belonging to the petitioner in Chikka Thimmanhalli in the Gudibanda Sub Taluk and praying for the removal of the present Shanbhog Gumasta of the said village

(2) Letter no. 4799/1483 dated 10th June 1895 from the Deputy Commr. of Kolar reporting that the Inam land referred to by the petitioner is an Enfranchised Inam having nothing to do with the office of Shanbhog though it formerly formed part of Sirkar Shanbhog service Inam lands and that the same is in the possession of the petitioner. ~~who is liable to pay the~~

* Reminder petition destroyed.

[illegible] this [illegible] is not found in the file. [illegible] Bnd [illegible] of the Petn is in the file.

x Survey No 35 a measuring 3-33 assessed at Rs. 4-- (Jodi)

L.R. 78-90-15.

~~Quit rent due thereon to government.~~

(3) ~~The records received with Hotar Deputy Comm's~~ Letter No. $\frac{4093}{1082}$ dated 22d. April 1896 from the same offr.

(VM)

Order No. $\frac{1887}{P.S. 4-96}$ & $\frac{17}{19}$. 8-96, Ern: one Ver: file.

The only point which requires orders is about the collection of the quit rent due on a private enfranchised Inam ~~land~~ in the holding of the petitioner. The Deputy Comm's report shows that this land has no connection whatever with the Shanbhog's Service Inam. ~~land~~ The petitioner has admittedly allowed the land to lie fallow on account of his misunderstanding with the officiating gumasta. For this result he has none to blame but himself. The proceeding is to be regulated by Sec 159 of the Land Rev Regulation & Rule XXXVI para 5 thereunder, and not para 3. The Deputy Commissioner will dispose

of this matter accordingly

2 The question of the present gumasta continuing to do the duties has already been decided by Government in 1892 and cannot now be reopened. It is however open to the registrar Shanbhag to resume the duties himself if deemed competent thereto by the Deputy Commissioner.

Draft 17-8-96

For Secretary

To the Deputy Commr. Kolar with records.

Endorsement to Petr.

HCh
15-8-96

8??

3672-3320
2757-2973
19-8-96

[illegible]

L. K. 78-70-16

[illegible] 1894 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1896

By order

Draft

17-8-96

~~For~~ Secretary

15/8/96